



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,227	03/16/2004	Raymond Saluccio	SALUCCIO 3.0-004	2015

7590 05/28/2008
EZRA SUTTON, P.A.
PLAZA 9
900 RT. 9
WOODBIDGE, NJ 07095

EXAMINER

HAQ, NAEEM U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/801,227	Applicant(s) SALUCCIO, RAYMOND	
	Examiner Naeem Haq	Art Unit 3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to the Applicant's amendment filed on June 11, 2007. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8-23 are pending and will be considered for examination.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: This claim recites "A **system** on the..."(emphasis added). However, the examiner notes that the body of the claim is directed to steps of a method. Furthermore, claims 5 and 6 are dependent on claim 4 and directed to a "method". Therefore, it appears that there is a typographical error in claim 4. This claim should be directed to a "method" and not a "system". For this reason, the examiner will treat claim 1 as a method claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

The preliminary amendment filed September 23, 2005 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as

Art Unit: 3625

follows: The original specification (filed on March 16, 2004) does not provide written support for the term “simulated”.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-6 and 8-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The term “simulated” lacks written description support in the original specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6 and 8-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 2, 6, 9, 10, 13, 20, and 21, the phrase "and the like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "and the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Referring to claims 1-6 and 8-23, the phrase "simulated prescription bottle" and "simulated prescription label" renders the claim indefinite. It is unclear to the examiner how a "simulated prescription bottle" differs from any other bottle and how a "simulated prescription label" differs from any other label. For examination purposes, the examiner will assume these phrases refer to any type of bottle and any type of label.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-6 and 8-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grasso (US 6,857,211 B2) in view of Bryant (GB 2342203 A) and further in view of Henson (US 6,167,383).

Referring to claim 1: Grasso discloses a method for designing a product in the form of a simulated prescription bottle containing a promotional message (col. 2, lines 9-16), the method comprising:

- preparing a non-medical simulated prescription label containing thereon a customized promotional message for promoting a product (col. 2, lines 9-30; Figure 1A and 1B);

- attaching said non-medical simulated prescription label onto a simulated prescription bottle for promoting said product (col. 2, lines 31-43).

Grasso does not teach selecting a filler to be inserted into said simulated prescription bottle. However, Bryant discloses a drug packaging method that selects a drug (i.e. filler) to be packaged (i.e. inserted) into a container (Abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Bryant into the invention of Grasso. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to fill the pharmaceutical container of Grasso. The cited prior art does not teach ordering said simulated prescription bottle, message, and said filler over the Internet. However, Henson discloses a method of ordering a configured product over the Internet (Abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Henson into the cited prior art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to increase sales volume by harnessing the power of the Internet.

Referring to claim 2: The cited prior art teaches or suggests all the limitations of claim 1 as noted above. Furthermore, Grasso teaches that the product selected for promotion on the label is a wine product (col. 2, lines 25-30).

Referring to claim 3: The cited prior art teaches or suggests all the limitations of claim 1 as noted above. Furthermore, Bryant teaches filler selected for inserting into the package (i.e. container) is a drug (Abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the

teachings of Bryant into the cited prior art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to fill the pharmaceutical container of Grasso.

Referring to claims 4 and 5: Grasso discloses a method for designing a product in the form of a simulated prescription bottle containing a promotional message (col. 2, lines 9-16), the method comprising:

- preparing a simulated prescription label containing thereon a customized promotional message for promoting a product (col. 2, lines 9-30; Figure 1A and 1B);
- attaching said simulated prescription label onto a simulated prescription bottle for promoting said product (col. 2, lines 31-43).

Grasso does not teach selecting a filler to be inserted into said simulated prescription bottle. However, Bryant discloses a drug packaging method that selects a drug (i.e. filler) to be packaged (i.e. inserted) into a container (Abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Bryant into the invention of Grasso. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to fill the pharmaceutical container of Grasso. The cited prior art does not teach ordering said simulated prescription bottle, message, and said filler over the Internet. However, Henson discloses a method of ordering a configured product over the Internet (Abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Henson into the cited prior art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to increase sales volume by harnessing

the power of the Internet. The cited prior art does not teach that the message is an emotional message for expressing an emotion. However, the Examiner notes that this limitation is not functionally involved in the steps of the recited method. Therefore this limitation is deemed to be nonfunctional descriptive material. The steps of the method would be the same regardless of the message printed on the label. The differences between the content of the Applicant's message and the prior art are merely subjective. Thus this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994) also see MPEP 2106. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place any content in the message of the cited prior art because such information does not functionally relate to the steps of the claimed method and because the subjective interpretation of information does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Referring to claims 6, 10, 13, 18, and 21: Claims 6, 10, 13, 18, and 21 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claim 3.

Referring to claims 8, 14, and 19: Claims 8, 14, and 19 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claim 1.

Referring to claim 9: Claim 9 is rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claim 2.

Referring to claims 11, 15, 16, 20, 22, and 23: Claims 11, 15, 16, 20, 22, and 23 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claim 4.

Referring to claims 12 and 17: Claims 12 and 17 are rejected under the same rationale as set forth above in claim 5.

Response to Arguments

The Applicant has argued that Grasso does not teach the term "non-medical". The examiner respectfully disagrees. Grasso discloses an invention that can be used for a variety of purposes such as a wine bottle or a shampoo container (Col. 2, lines 10-16). For this reason, the examiner maintains the art rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naeem Haq whose telephone number is (571)-272-6758. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith can be reached on (571)-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Naeem Haq/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625

May 22, 2008